



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,310	11/14/2003	Zhihong Ye	133071	1208

6147 7590 03/12/2007
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
GLOBAL RESEARCH
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER

PARRIES, DRU M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2836

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,310

Applicant(s)

YE ET AL.

Examiner

Dru M. Parries

Art Unit

2836

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-8 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 5, 9, 10, 14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-5-06.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on October 5, 2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and accordingly, has been considered by the examiner.
2. Applicant's arguments filed December 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the 112 rejections, claims 3, 8, and 13 still have phrases that need to be amended. Also, another phrase was found in claim 2.
3. Applicant's arguments filed December 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, Wall does teach, "determining a phase shift of a voltage based on multiple measurements over multiple periods of time." He teaches "*actively* detecting generation islands" ([0002]), which implies on an ongoing basis (multiple periods of time). He also teaches taking multiple measurements of the frequency of the voltage signal via the first and second phase locked loops ([0009]). Also, because Wall teaches phase locked loops, it is inherent that a comparison is made between current and previous measurements.
4. Applicant's arguments, see page 9-10, filed December 14, 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 2, 3, 7, 8, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Pawate et al. (5,749,064).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2836

6. Claims 2, 3, 8, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims all include the phrase, “frequency/frequencies/comparison of a current/previous zero-crossing”. The Examiner believes the Applicant intended to mean the “frequency/frequencies/comparison at a current/previous zero-crossing”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wall (2004/0178641). Wall teaches a circuit for preventing islanding in a power system. He teaches monitoring a voltage measurement (356) and determining a phase shift of a generator by actively taking multiple measurements of the frequency of the generator, estimating the phase angle, and calculating the phase shift ([0009]). He goes on to teach comparing the determined phase shift to a threshold phase shift ($\pi/2$) and if the phase shift is greater than the threshold then issuing a command for a disconnect of the generator ([0128]). He also teaches a computer (i.e. processor, memory and input/output unit) for executing the above method of prevention ([0123]). He also teaches disconnecting the generator by an under frequency procedure ([0125]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wall (2004/0178641) and Pawate et al. (5,749,064). Wall teaches a circuit for preventing islanding in a power system as described above. Wall teaches determining the phase shift using phase locked loops, among other things ([0009]). Also, because Wall teaches the use of phase locked loops, it is inherent that a comparison is made between current and previous measurements. Wall fails to explicitly teach when the frequency measurements take place. Pawate teaches measuring the frequency of a signal at zero crossing points (Col. 4, lines 33-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to measure the frequency of a signal at the zero crossing points to help determine the phase shift of the voltage in Wall's invention since Wall doesn't explicitly teach when the frequency measurements of the voltage are taken and Pawate teaches a known method of using the zero-crossings to determine the frequency.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These claims are allowable because no prior art of record teaches the equations used to find the phase shift of a signal.

Art Unit: 2836

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday from 9:00am to 6:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x 36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

3-1-2007



CHAU N. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER